

Appendix A. Comments on Fish Creek Acquisition EA received by the deadline.

Com-ment #	Para-graph	Comment
1		I support Alternative A - the purchase of 40,945 acres from the Nature Conservancy. This looks like the best way to protect these resource values for future generations. As we all know, once prime wildlife habitat gets developed into subdivisions it is lost forever. Good job!!!!
2		I fully support FWP's acquisition of this key property west of Missoula. I look forward to exploring the area on foot and with a fly rod. Thanks for getting this into public ownership.
3	1	I have a long time acquaintance with the Fish Creek area, as both a wildlife biologist and outdoor recreationist. Therefore, I reviewed the Fish Creek EA with great care and interest. The following are my comments, which support the Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks (FWP) acquisition of approximately 41,000 acres from The Nature Conservancy (TNC).
3	2	Montana sportsmen will benefit from this proposed action. This is a large drainage with very good big game and game fish populations. This area has provided Montanans high quality hunting and fishing opportunities for many years. Those opportunities are for both the sportsman that prefers being close to open roads and the hunter/fisherman that likes a backcountry/near wilderness experience. As described in the EA, large numbers of elk, mule deer, white-tailed deer, moose, black bear, mountain lion, mountain grouse, wild turkey, cutthroat trout, and rainbow trout occupy the drainage and give sportsmen some remarkable opportunities. Much of the higher elevation habitats are publicly owned and managed by the Lolo National Forest. TNC recognized these benefits to sportsmen. It also recognized that Plum Creek Timber (PTC) was reducing sportsmen opportunities, during the past 10 years, by selling its key holdings in the drainage. The very real danger of continued disposal of these lands and loss of public access and use will persist, until FWP acquires and manages these properties to benefit sportsmen, wildlife and fish.
3	3	Game populations will benefit from this proposed action, further enhancing sportsmen's opportunities. The history of management of FWP-owned lands documents the agency's ability and success in improving wildlife and fish habitat. This is a long-term process, and not an easy one. It requires knowledge, determination, cooperation and funding. Most importantly, it is driven by the mission of FWP, which is unlike that of any other land manager in Montana. No other potential owner can come close to FWP in its desire and ability to improve wildlife habitat in Montana for Montanans. Human population growth and development of "wild" lands has been rapid and pervasive, during the past 20 years. The pressures to market and develop these lands will continue to increase. The proposed action will benefit Montana sportsmen in more ways than we can imagine for more than a hundred years.
3	4	While preserving and enhancing game and fish and providing sportsmen with recreational opportunities are very important to Montanans, the State of Montana is also obligated to preserve other non-consumable wild species. Our American history demonstrates the wisdom of protecting the needs of species, before they become threatened and endangered. Once critical habitats and populations reach the danger zone, the costs of protection rise exponentially. The EA correctly identifies linkage as a benefit for a variety of wild species, primarily forest carnivores and bull trout. These are not popular species, and sometimes ridiculed, but they are important to our forest ecosystems. Many species that naturally occur in low densities and require very large blocks of habitat to successfully reproduce and survive, occupy Fish Creek and the neighboring landscapes. Without being able to move between habitats to the north and south, these populations risk possible extinction. During the past 30 years, the Clark Fork River valley between Missoula and St Regis has been subdivided, developed and populated by Montanans. Some of these forest carnivores are at risk because they are seen as a threat to humans and their properties. Others intentionally avoid human activities. One of the least developed portions of the Clark Fork River valley lies between Cyr and Tarkio. Wolves and grizzly bears are known to have used this area crossing the valley from north to south and vice versa. Other species, notably lynx and wolverine, probably do also. FWP already owns and manages some of this land. The proposed acquisition of lands on both sides of the Clark Fork by FWP builds on its current ownership. This will help ensure that linkage is provided for those wild species that are highly dependent on very large blocks of wild habitats, where the current risk of aggravating human inhabitants is low.
3	5	This is a good time to invest in the future. The cost per acre for this purchase is so good that it should not be refused. Most such land acquisitions in western Montana typically cost 10 times the approximately \$350 per acre for Fish Creek. In part, the price is so low because PCT harvested virtually all merchantable trees in the past 15 years and, in part, because of the wildfires earlier in this decade. Nevertheless, this land will never be so cheap again, and the trees will ultimately re-establish themselves. I can envision a time when FWP allows timber harvests to improve wildlife and fisheries habitat, thereby creating jobs and providing much needed funds for the public coffers.
3	6	This is a great opportunity for FWP to protect and enhance wildlife habitat, protect future hunting and fishing opportunities, reduce risks for endangered species and do so with a relatively low initial investment of \$14 million.
4	1	I will be at the meeting tonight in Superior and have made some notes. I have reviewed the information provided by Sharon which answered some of my concerns. I have noted some things below which you may be covering tonight. Hopefully you will receive in time to consider.

Com- ment #	Para- graph	Comment
4	2	1) Commissioners support acquisition which should indicate there is no negative impact to the county. Does this mean they are not concerned with funding any services (law enforcement or fire protection) this acquisition may create?
4	3	2) Tax revenues to county will not change. FWP will pay \$50,000 per year based on current assessment. What assurances will there be for these funds to be used to support the increased need for law enforcement and fire protection in the area surrounding the park/WMA?
4	4	3) How will fire protection in the area be handled? There are concerns that bringing more folks into the area during fire season may create a higher fire danger requiring an increase in services resulting in higher property taxes.
4	5	4) Besides restricting commercial hunting and fishing, what change in access will impact Joe Public? Will access improve?
4	6	5) Will weed abatement improve from past ten years?
4	7	6) Will pine beetle infestation improve from past ten years?
4	8	7) Report states \$300,000 will go into a maintenance account. What maintenance requirements are these funds expected to cover. Is this an annual budget amount or one-time funding? What funds will be available for future maintenance needs?
4	9	8) When will park be developed? How will development be determined? Can any of the park fees be used to support local services (park ranger, fire protection, law enforcement). Note: Would like to see: a campground respectful of wildlife – bear proof containers/lockers for food storage and garbage cans throughout park; campground with camp hosts to enforce rules; camp sites with electrical and septic hook-ups for RV campers; well maintained restrooms; input from the community on campground development as noted in EA.
4	10	9) Are their plans for ATV or snow mobiling trails in either the park or WMA? If so, input from community should be considered as well as impact to wildlife. Not saying it shouldn't be allowed – just needs to be well thought out.
4	11	10) Will any of the currently closed roads be opened for access?
4	12	11) Challenges noted on page 21. What planning will take place to address these issues?
4	13	12) Are there still plans for an additional on/off ramp between the existing ones at Fish Creek and Tarkio?
4	14	13) Have there been discussions about the increase in traffic on Old Hwy 10 between the exit at Cyr and Fish Creek and the impact this will have on a roadway already in need of repair and to the Cyr Bridge?
5	1	I am writing in opposition to the proposed establishment of a 6,000+ acre state park in the Fish Creek drainage. I believe this proposal is analogous to putting a toxic waste dump next to a pre-school. Fish Creek is a rare treasure in that it is one of the few remaining <i>uncrowded</i> fisheries where even an average angler can routinely catch 20" trout on a dry fly. I am afraid this proposal will result in Fish Creek being loved to death.
5	2	I have lived in Montana and fished all of the famous trout streams here for 18 years. Fish Creek is my favorite stream of all of them. It has beautiful scenery and huge trout. Every single year I marvel at the fact that it still hasn't been "discovered." However, it is also a tiny, delicate stream with relatively few fish per mile. It will never stand up the added angling pressure that will come with a huge state park.
5	3	I would also worry about the road. As is, the road is narrow and treacherous and it runs right along the stream in places. It is not suitable for RV's or trailers and is one lane in places. If left alone, I don't think it would handle the extra traffic. If enlarged...well, then it becomes like every other fishing road in Montana (i.e. lower Rock Creek Road)—loved to death.
5	4	The tragic irony of Fish Creek to me is that a private lumber company, the purported enemy of trout everywhere, was a decent steward of this land; and now the government—rightful protector of fish and wildlife—wants to take over and most likely ruin one of the greatest trout streams I have ever known.
5	5	Please don't do it. People can go to a KOA and catch fish from a pond. Or put a state park one on the upper Clark Fork, or the Blackfoot, just please not on Fish Creek.
6		I am writing to notify you that I support the proposal to build a park at Fish Creek. I grew up in Montana when most of it was accessible for recreation, now it is not. I want my children and their children to have places for camping, hiking and fishing. I think this is a great idea. I hope motorcycle use is limited as noisy machines aren't great companions for camping and star gazing. Thank you.
7		I am in favor of the state ownership of the Fish Creek lands and the proposal for a state park. Development of the state park would be good however, I would like to see such improvements as campgrounds, etc only in areas close to the Interstate or well-used roads. This would maintain protection for wildlife, water quality, and general habitat.
8	1	I fully support the effort of MT Fish, Wildlife and Parks to purchase lands in Fish Creek now held by The Nature Conservancy.
8	2	But I am "on the fence" about creating a Park on those same lands. I'd like to know more details, especially the extent of development which I feel should be minimal.
8	3	I have not been in that area for several years and do not know current access policies. I am not in support of increasing ORV use, but would rather see more "foot use", ie, trails maintained for hiking and horses/mules/packstrings.

Com- ment #	Para- graph	Comment
8	4	From the mid 70's to mid 80's, Fish Creek was one of my primary patrol areas when I was with the US Forest Service, especially during hunting seasons for road closure enforcement. While I did not actually live there I was still in the "neighborhood" as a many year resident of the Nine Mile area.
8	5	During those patrols over the years I remember seeing Bulltrout, watching moose and being particularly excited observing cow moose with calves, monitoring recently re-introduced beaver which had been previously trapped out of the entire drainage (as an undergrad wildlife bio project), and hearing of the occasional sighting of grizzly and wolf sign in the Great Burn area. To me, Fish Creek is a very special place and I can't think of a better entity to oversee it's management than FWP.
9		I agree wholeheartedly with the purchase of the "plum creek lands" in the Fish Creek drainage, but I disagree with the plan for a 7650 acre park. I don't like the idea of spending money on the construction and maintenance of the proposed park. Camping and recreating in Montana's outdoors doesn't always mean taking your 30' camper to a campground 'in the woods" or riding your horse or backpacking into wilderness. I think the best use of these "new" lands would be similar to the recent past, hunting, fishing, trail riding, snowmobiling, wood gathering etc. Thank you for listening.
10		Sharon, I am not sure who was the hearings officer at last night meeting but if you would pass this on I would appreciate the effort. I questioned if the proposed campground is subject to subdivision review. According to MCA 76-3-205... state owned parcels that don't create a parcel will not be subject to review. So my question was answered and does not need to be addressed. Thanks
11	1	First off, outstanding presentation by your group in the Superior meeting on the 2nd.
11	2	After getting home and reading the proposal we do have a couple more comments.
11	3	In 7.6 you point out the opportunities for floating the Gorge by "Joe Public"etc.. 3 points on this:
11	4	1. The Gorge is a destination, by that I mean, right now the gorge is heavily used by people that have a knowledge and respect of the power of this river. That is why they come. A guy driving a RV from Florida, camped in the campground with a Port-a-Boat attached to the side of it has no business on this river. Yes there are those who have the knowledge of a river that are campers, however they aren't going to be the ones up there in the campground, they will be down here at the river camped in a "closed to camping area". FWP as well as other law enforcement personnel are short handed and can't reasonably be out here all the time to police the area.
11	5	2. The Mineral County Search and Rescue is not prepared, trained or even familiar with the area to respond to more incidents on this river or this area, with the exception of Mike and his MT river guides. In fact we have even had Forest Service Fire personnel, while parked on I-90, state they didn't know how to get in here and that was right after the big fire. The Police, MHP, Frenchtown ambulance race up and down our roads looking for the incident area or access areas where someone is in trouble or dead. SAD! They need to know this area before anything that draws more people here is put in.
11	6	3. If the public use of the river increases the "river recreation carrying capacity" will the permits to outfitters be decreased? FWP is making money off the outfitters while Kayakers, private boaters pay nothing to use the river. And those are the ones who ignore the speed limits, encroach on private property, ignore closed area signs, no campfire signs, and leave all kinds of litter.
11	7	Next comment: It is very well and good that you have the visions of off road vehicles, horses, cycling, hiking, fishing etc having their space because everyone wants a piece of the pie. However if you look at this realistically you know that all their paths will cross. Eventually the horse users and hunters will complain about the ATV users and the cycling, hiking and fishing users will complain about the horse users and the ATV users. And then the environmentalists will put their two cents in and the area will be closed. Right now isn't the area is being used by all parties anyways? Yes they'd like more but with that your going to have more to deal with and the way the Government is going with less monies=less employees.
11	8	Last Comment: Even though we are land owners on the North side of this proposed park we will still feel the impact of more visitors to the area. Since we have been here we have voiced our concerns, as I did at the meeting, on the excessive use of the roads, fire danger and lack of law enforcement in the area. To this date nothing has changed or been addressed.
11	9	At the meeting, I believe it was Mack who acknowledged the Fish Creek Working Group for the job they did which I'm assuming was to get comments etc. This puzzle me, as well as other people who reside out here, as to who these people are and why we were not contacted by them especially since we are the ones who this will impact the most.
11	10	Once again its the ideas and comments of people that won't have to deal with the problems that will be generated by this park.
11	11	I also was told that this is also being looked at as economic plus for Mineral Co. Reality is the revenue from the campground will not stay here entirely. It will be added to the pot as does the revenue that is generated off of the gorge and dispersed around the state. That just isn't right.
11	12	In conclusion:

Com- ment #	Para- graph	Comment
11	13	In favor of the land purchase for Wildlife and Fisheries.....keep it as it is now....you can camp ,fish, hunt, there is some ATV riding and riding horses. Everything your proposing is already here.....
11	14	Put the park somewhere else...
12		Hello... Well let's try this again. Accidentally pressed the send key before I was done composing. I fully support the purchase of the Fish Creek area. I fully support development of a State Park. I would like to see many,many,many miles of roads in this area closed and re-vegetated. Some roads should be converted to hiking and horseback trails. Please do not develop any motorized "trails" . Folks that want to drive motor vehicles can use the nearby Interstate highway. Please do not allow bicycles on the trails. Make them for relaxed walking and horse use. Folks in Missoula can ride their bicycles to work or school rather than drag them to a new State Park. Try to put trailheads right at the campground so that folks can start walking right from their camp. This works great at L/C Caverns State Park. Please as with all State Parks ask people to keep their dogs on a leash. How about no dogs on trails also. I would like that.
13		I have always enjoyed the Fish Creek drainage but find camping iffy at best. Do proceed to build a campground in your plans for the new park. -Native Missoulian
14	1	I attended the meeting in Superior last night and have read the EA and have these questions, concerns & comments.
14	2	In general, I prefer to see the property in government rather than private lands. However, despite the comment in the EA (pg. 22) that "local lifestyles . . . would be maintained and likely enhanced", that almost certainly will not be the case for those of us living in the vicinity of the proposed purchase and especially of the proposed park and campground. I suspect that if the FWP personnel at the meeting and involved in this project lived as I do at the Rivulet at the mouth of McGinty Gulch, you'd feel the same way.
14	3	1. Assuming that state park funds are needed to complete the purchase, then my preference would be that the park not include a campground (but perhaps the "park" concept, by definition, includes "campground").
14	4	2. The acreage between Rivulet and the mouth of Quartz Creek should be excluded as part of a park. Perhaps that parcel could be exchanged for DNRC or USFS land or be designated as part of the WMA. If it's retained as a state park, then traffic should be discouraged between there and the rest of the park, perhaps by not providing directional signage, in order to minimize road use (& therefore maintenance), noise, dust pollution, etc. I'd be very interested in knowing the rationale for including that parcel as "park"; there's virtually no place to park, the road between Rivulet & Quartz Creek is not suitable for trailer traffic (there's a USFS sign to that effect), it's narrow & frequently becomes virtually impossible due to spring mud & summer dust (dry clay). A couple of years back a vehicle actually bogged down & got stuck in the dust on the stretch.
14	5	3. There should be no designated trails for use by off-road vehicles (OHV's). I would prefer that OHV's be completely banned from use in the proposed purchase area or, failing that, that they not be encouraged & that their use be absolutely minimal.
14	6	4. Consideration and provision must be made for those of us with water rights in the area. For example, several of us living at Rivulet have water rights in McGinty Gulch, a portion of the lower part of which passes through the proposed WMA. The locked gate providing access for water system (pipe) maintenance up McGinty Gulch should remain in place. Chemical weed control should be kept away from the system which includes a small concrete reservoir on the bench above Rivulet.
14	7	5. Please be sure to discuss additional required road maintenance with Mineral County. Even with normal traffic, the road becomes very washboardy soon after grading, especially on the sharp, steep bends between the Fish Creek bridge and the proposed campground area, but in other sections of the road also. The county road crew does an excellent job but their resources (people, budget) are limited.
14	8	6. Please consider "safety zone" signs around Rivulet, especially during hunting season. If you feel they will be needed around the proposed cabin rental on Williams Peak, they will certainly be needed at Rivulet given the anticipated increase in hunting pressure which will likely accompany advertisement of a new state park.
14	9	In summary, as a general observation, FWP plans for substantial additional human activity in the area seem inconsistent with the stated priority of the plan to protect and provide for wildlife.
14	10	When you or your staff are in the area, please stop by. I'll put the coffee pot on and we can talk about these and a few other matters.
15		I would like to add my wife and I as supporting the State Park in the Fish Creek area. I think it would a convenient location for out of state visitors, and would help the economy of Mineral County. Respectfully;
16		I am a land owner of 12 years at Tarkio with approx 3500' of river frontage. I would like to voice my support for the project,especially the State Park. I think the long term vision is the park would be a tremendous asset for the area and Mineral County.
17	1	I strongly approve of FWP acquiring the Fish Creek lands.
17	2	The land should be managed as wilderness. All motorized vehicles should be prohibited beyond Fish Creek and West Fork roads. I approve of obliterating old logging roads or converting them to trails for <i>nonmotorized</i> use. I strongly approve of habitat restoration efforts.

Com- ment #	Para- graph	Comment
17	3	I strongly disapprove of any new campgrounds. The campgrounds at Big Pine and Forks are OK as is. I see no need for State Park status. The whole thing should be a Wildlife Management area with minimal development.
18		See pages A-25 to A-27
19	1	I have lived and worked in the community of Alberton, Montana for approximately 40 years. During this tenure, I worked 35 seasons with the U.S. Forest Service at the Ninemile Ranger District. I am very familiar with the Fish Creek Drainage and all of it natural beauty.
19	2	I am in favor of the proposed land Acquisition of the Fish Creek EA by the FWP. I am confident that FWP will continue to make conscientious decisions for the enhancement of this area.
20	1	I would like to voice my support for the proposed State Park near Fish Creek west of Alberton, MT.
20	2	I am a native of the Missoula area who runs a river based business out of a property owned just west of the Fish Creek exit off of I-90. After having grown up in Missoula and having run my business, World Class Kayak Academy for the past eight years out of Mineral County I feel I have a basis of judgement in saying a state park in the area would benefit both the natural and human resources the area has to offer. The beauty of the land and the recreational opportunity of the river support a healthy tourism industry, which brings much needed sustainable revenue to the area without any negative impact on the environment. Furthermore, with increased opportunity for open space the value of the available land for development would improve for the future, in what is currently a stagnant market. With both of the advantages mentioned, the economic and aesthetic opportunity for current and future residents of the area would see long term positive effects.
21		See pages A-28 to A-29
22	1	We all reside in the Cyr area on acreage that is bordered or surrounded by Forest Service land. We live in the area because of the beauty and openness of the landscape, the abundant wildlife, and the relaxed rural lifestyle.
22	2	The circumstances under which we are asked to take a position on the above proposal aren't ideal. There are a number of critical issues pending that rise concerns. However, we understand the need for Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks (FWP) to commit to the purchase of the land without answers and solutions to all questions and concerns so the purchase can proceed and timelines can be met. With this in mind, the primary question for us to answer is: who do we believe would be the best stewards of the land? We asked ourselves who would manage the land in a way to keep the best interest of wildlife and public access in mind. We also considered past experience with various government entities to measure the trust and confidence level of those involved. We concluded that it would be in the best interests of the State of Montana and the community for FWP to own the land and as a result support the proposal for FWP to purchase the 40,945 acres described in the above proposal. We agree that this land acquisition will provide FWP with the opportunity to protect the watershed, maintain critical habitat for bull trout and Westslope cutthroat trout, protect and enhance critical winter range and other seasonal habitats for a diversity of wildlife, and preserve and important forest carnivore linkage zone between the Ninemile Divide and Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness. FWP is in the business of managing wildlife areas and have staff with the knowledge, skills, and abilities to perform these vital functions effectively.
22	3	We are concerned, however, that bringing more people into this particular area by establishing a State park with the existing infrastructure may be counterproductive to the protection efforts mentioned above. The existing roads into and within this area are narrow, winding and unpaved. The primary road in the area is also next to Fish Creek itself. Existing traffic on these roads during the peak use period creates extensive dust that ends up in the creek and foliage along the creek. At times of heavy rain and/or snow melt, parts of the road have actually fallen into the creek. Increasing traffic will obviously exacerbate both problems.
22	4	The thought that the traffic could increase to the level currently experienced by the area around Rock Creek in Missoula County comes to mind. Traveling down the narrow roads in that area is a white knuckle experience, having to drive around the numerous vehicles parked off to the side of the road, nearly missing speeding vehicles coming towards us on our side of the road, avoiding pedestrians crossing the road near blind corners, and trying not to bounce off the road into the creek because of the poor road conditions. Inviting more folks into the Fish Creek area by developing a park could create an environment similar to Rock Creek.
22	5	We agree that an equestrian campground is needed. We are not sure the proposed location is conducive to the protection efforts. These campers will use the existing roads pulling large horse/camp trailers to access the proposed sites. The current location requires the users to drive through the entire park and into the wildlife management area (WMA). Locating the equestrian campground closer to the highway with trails into the WMA might be a better choice.

Com- ment #	Para- graph	Comment
22	6	Regarding the suggestion that trails be established for off-road vehicles and ATVs seems extremely counterproductive to wildlife conservation no matter what the time of year or area within the WMA. Noise alone will disrupt the wildlife not to mention the affects of dust, potential litter, and the destruction caused by those who simply refuse to stay on the designated trails. We are ATV owners and enjoy riding up to the Hole-in-the-Wall Lodge and traveling the existing open roads and believe no additional public ATV access is needed. However, consideration should be given during the planning process to access for persons with disabilities so that they too may access passable roadways to enjoy the public land. This does not mean that we support opening new roadways or trails for an and all ATVs and the two should not be confused. For example, during hunting season(s), access to gated roads should be expanded to those hunters with legitimate disabilities. People registered with the State of Montana who possess a disability sticker should be allowed access to the same areas others can access by foot or by horse. In order to do this, FWP should consider some sort of registration process where individuals certified as disabled can register for a key to the locked gate so that they may be able to access the property in an off-road vehicle. Obviously, consideration will need to be given as a whether or not the road can be traveled safely in this fashion and perhaps a waiver form signed when the key is issued. A number of roads that have been maintained for vehicle use prior to closure could be considered for this type of access.
22	7	In addition to the concerns an increase in users will have on wildlife and the protection effort, we are concerned about the potential fiscal impact to an already financially challenged county. More people visiting means more: traffic and potholes; litter; squabbles for the Sheriff; lost hikers and capsized rafts for the County Search and Rescue; vandalism and car break-ins at boat launch sites and fishing accesses requiring law enforcement investigative hours; forest fires from camp fires, unauthorized off-road vehicles, and careless smokers. Without a detailed fiscal analysis illustrating otherwise, we are convinced that \$50,000 in property tax revenue will not pay for the increased services the park will require (even if it was all allocated for that purpose). Approximately 64% (\$32,000) of the \$50,000 paid will go to fund schools and only 6.90% (\$3,450.00) for public safety. Without a plan in place to specifically allocate the \$300,000 set aside for "maintenance", it is unknown where those dollars will be used and how long the funds will last.
22	8	Development of a State park of this size will be expensive. We are not aware of any design or construction funds allocated for this purpose. Our expectations of what a park in this area would be like are high. We would expect a well designed and equipped park with electricity, septic hookups, space for camp hosts, a secured entrance for check in by a caretaker or ranger, bear proof garbage containers and food lockers, restrooms, designated campfire areas, water, etc. We would expect leash laws and other restrictions (curfews and noise levels) to be enforced by staff on the premises. Since there are no plans to hire additional FWP staff for this project and no funds allocated for maintenance, we have concerns about how the park will be maintained and managed.
22	9	We understand that the parks budget within FWP may be necessary to fully fund this acquisition. We are concerned that this fiscal restriction could jeopardize the transaction. It is our hope that careful consideration can be given to the importance of the protection objectives of this proposal. Satisfactory public access with continue with the proposed WMA without the park feature.
22	10	It is our understanding that with a park, an access fee will be charged for use of the park and campground. Should it be determined that a park is a good fit for the area, we believe a portion of that fee should go to Mineral County to pay for garbage collection and weed control of the areas around county owned roads into the park area.
22	11	Clearly, a culture has developed over the years by the access and use afforded by previous land owners. This culture includes commercial hunting and fishing and firewood gathering. We are concerned about the proposed elimination of these important cultural attributes. Restricting commercial outfitting will limit access to those persons who do not possess the ability to enjoy the outdoors with a guide. This industry and others in the county rely on out-of-state hunters and tourists for income. Locals in the community have come to rely on the firewood provided by the land, some of which have wood as an only heat source. Keeping supervised wood gathering period a couple of months out of the year should be considered.
22	12	We have observed a decrease in the number of visiting elk and deer and have had more predators (bear and mountain lion) come into our populated areas. This activity has not been prevalent in the previous 15+ years we have owned this land. We believe this is due to other predatory factors in the high elevations (wolves) reducing the herd population and forcing predators to look in the more populated areas for food. Also, while hunting in the area the past two season, we have found a number of wolf tracks and have seen wolves tracking the same elk we were after. We have also personally observed a number (dozens) of carcass/bone piles in the area near Williams Peak Lookout when visiting that area. We believe the elk herd at risk is being harmed by predators (lions and wolves) and not humans and are concerned that closing this winter range area will simply give these predators a free meal ticket and the heard will be further depleted. We believe this area needs to remain open to hunters during bear, wolf and lion seasons to harvest these predators and to maintain a healthy balance.

Com- ment #	Para- graph	Comment
22	13	We believe if additional campgrounds are established, there will be an increase in visitors to the fishing access at Cry and an increase in the number of kayakers and rafters. These visitors will use the Cry Bridge and Old Highway 10 between Cyr and Fish Creek for access. At the present time, Old Highway 10 has more potholes than not and the bridge driving base and railing is in need of renovation. Photos of the Cry Bridge can be seen by going to www.cyrbridge.blogspot.com . There are currently no funds allocated by the State or the County to renovate either the road or the bridge.
22	14	Finally, as we alluded to earlier, supporting this land acquisition requires us to blindly trust FWP and its staff without plans and funding for crucial pieces in place. We expect FWP to carefully listen to the concerns of the property owners in the area and to not provide "lip service" to any of them. Their concerns are legitimate and should be carefully considered. When work groups are established, we expect the recommendations implemented from these work groups to be conducive to the protection efforts of the WMA. If FWP says they are going to do something, do it. If an idea or recommendation from a work group is not in line with the protection efforts, own up to that, stay on track, and insist that the work group maintain the appropriate focus.
22	15	We appreciate the opportunity to comment on this proposal. We also want to comment FWP management and staff for their efforts these past 12 years to get the point of purchasing this land and protecting its valuable assets.
23	1	I and other members of my family own property next to some of this land, and we have water rights on two springs on this land. We would like to have in writing that before this purchase by the state that we will still have the same water rights. One spring has supplied water to our properties and has been in our families use for over 100 years.
23	2	We would also like some assurance that after a couple years the state will not stop paying taxes on this property. Mineral County is not a rich county and to remove some of their tax base would be hard on the county.
23	3	Looking forward to hearing from you on this.
24		I support the FWP plan to aquire land in Fish Creek from the Nature Conservancy and to create a state park there. Additionally, I strongly support a complete ban of all motorized recreation, including ATVs, snowmobiles and motorboats, within any new State Park at Fish Creek, .
25	1	The plan should include a somewhat detailed discussion of the mineral rights, answering such questions as:
25	2	• Who owns the mineral rights?
25	3	• What commercially valuable minerals exist?
25	4	• What is the history of mineral extraction?
25	5	• What is the likelihood of mineral extraction in the future?
25	6	• What is the general location(s) of commercially valuable minerals? Etc.
26	1	--I am wholeheartedly in favor of the land acquisition in the Fish Creek drainage. The purchase of this vital habitat and recreation resource will protect and preserve the area for generations to enjoy.
26	2	--I am opposed to development of this area as a state park. I prefer the primitive nature of the area for game security and protection of the watershed. Increased development like RV campgrounds would increase motorized use, displace game, and diminish the value of hunting and fishing recreation recreation in the area.
26	3	Thank you for your consideration. Feel free to contact me if you have any questions regarding these comments.
27	1	I do not want my federal tax dollars to be used to create an expensive state park on Fish Creek. I would much prefer that this land be made into a wildlife management area instead. The impact of a multi-use park would severely impact the fragile habitat needed for fish and wildlife preservation. There are numerous opportunities for public access to public land and a diminishing amount available for wildlife conservation.
27	2	I applaud your efforts in purchasing the land for future generations. I would prefer that this land be used to maintain the rich ecosystem present in Montana today and not to cater to the instant gratification of those looking for weekend entertainment. Please maintain a wildlife area instead.
28		Please purchase the 41,000 acres from the Nature Conservancy to protect and propagate Bull trout up by Superior. This sounds like a good use of habitat.
29	1	Regarding 41,000 of important habitat in the Fish Creek drainage.
29	2	There is a demonstrated need to purchase the lands for fish and wildlife habitat, public access, and public recreation, but there is no demonstrated need to create a new, expensive state park.
29	3	Purchase the land and make it all a state wildlife management area.
29	4	h Wildlife and fish values of the area will be undermined by the contemplated park development. It is unnecessary to develop campgrounds in the Fish Creek drainage, and that there are alternative sites available for purchase and campground development near the Interstate at Cyr.
29	5	FWP deserves credit for deciding to use our hunting and angling dollars to purchase the lands for a wildlife management area. Thank You!
30		We would love to see the proposed park at Fish Creek. Absolutely!
31		See page A-30
32		I write to support this acquisition. It is an important tributary because of habitat for T&E species and for water quality. Please keep it primitive. No non-primitive campgrounds please

Com- ment #	Para- graph	Comment
33		Definitely a good thing to have bought the land along fish creek from TNC. Well done. Hopefully there will not be a state park there. The land is too much in use by precious wildlife, not to mention scenic, to be marred in such a manner. People floating the Gorge can use potentially expanded facilities at Cyr which is already developed and handy.
34	1	We heartily applaud the acquisition of the Nature Conservancy (formerly Plum Creek) land in the Fish Creek drainage. This is a very important purchase and FWP should be commended for the effort.
34	2	We want to urge you to purchase the land and make it a state wildlife management area where fish and wildlife and conservation friendly recreation take precedence.
34	3	A state park in Fish Creek is a bad idea. There is no need to create a new, expensive state park. It is unnecessary to develop campgrounds in the Fish Creek drainage. The existing campgrounds bring in too many people on holiday weekends as it is. The area will be undermined by the contemplated park development and will undermine the fish and wildlife conservation efforts.
35	1	Your Fish Creek drainage land purchase from TNC is well done. Congratulations! However, your proposal to create a state park on more than 7,000 acres of the area, including in the middle of critical winter range and encompassing important riparian areas needed for fish conservation is a bad idea . Please seek out expert wilderness and wildlife growth and preservation information before making your final decision. Also, please seek out public views of this matter in an open and transparent way.
35	2	While there is a demonstrated need to purchase the lands for fish and wildlife habitat, public access, and public recreation, there is no demonstrated need to create a new, expensive state park. Many realize that land purchase can easily become state wildlife management area, where fish and wildlife -- as well as fishing, hunting and other forms of recreation consistent with conservation take precedence. Surely the people of Montana would appreciate this very thoughtful and long-term management approach to the well-being of such a precious area. wildlife and fish values of the area will be undermined by park development, which FWP indicates could include two large multi-unit campgrounds (including in winter range and in a wildlife corridor) that would accommodate RVs, one on the north and one on the south at the Fish Creek forks; a developed "equestrian" trailhead complex; developed roads and trails to accommodate some ATV use; and commercial ventures like a hut-to-hut system of yurts and a rental lookout.
35	3	-I It is unnecessary to develop campgrounds in the Fish Creek drainage, and that there are alternative sites available for purchase and campground development near the Interstate at Cyr.
35	4	Again, please take these matters and their alternatives into serious consideration in an open and transparent manner. Include expert and public views and we are all likely to be best satisfied by the final outcome of your fine actions to date.
36		Mack , you and your crew did a great job in superior thanks so much,as a long time user of Fish crk,30+ yr i must say your plan at this point looks flawless .the park is a great idea and i wouldnt let one loud mouth newcomer change your mind, it might be different if he wasnt trying to sell you his own land. once again isay stick to your plan it is a great one. thank you
37		I am against any development to the recently purchased fish creek area. There is no need for campgrounds, equeasrian trails, etc. Keeping the land pristene will do more for fishing than inviting development. There are other options for campgrounds and the like in the local area. Thank-you.
38	1	Thank you for the opportunity to comment. My wife and I are generally in favor of the FWP purchase of Nature Conservancy lands in Mineral County.
38	2	I would like to offer the following comments:
38	3	1) Regarding firewood cutting: Even though this normally has not been allowed in other WMAs and state parks, I suggest that these former Plum Creek lands are different. Because of extensive logging and fires, regeneration is creating single age stands. For example there are large 30 year old clearcuts in Sections 17 and 18, T. 15 N, R 24 W(in Nemote Creek drainage), which need thinning. Proper management can create multi-age stands which would enhance wildlife habitat. Why not allow firewood cutters to assist with that thinning? Or pole cutters? Also, in this same area recent logging activity has left pulled over trees from line machines, which is an unnatural occurance. And burned trees no doubt will be falling over roads. These are just a few examples where firewood cutting can aid in returning the forest to a more natural condition. The EA too quickly dismisses the potential benefits of firewood cutting for wildlife habitat. There is a long tradition of firewood cutting by locals, who are experienced and willing to assume any risk.
38	4	2) Regarding roads, most of them are already gated or blocked. Please consider keeping remaining roads open for multiple use, or gated during part of the year. I was surprised that Plum Creek recently blocked the lower road traversing the clearcut in Section 18 referred to above. If it were gated instead, you could better manage thinning of the regeneration, weed spraying of the road, and it would provide access for fire fighting in close proximity to the Fold of the Messiah community.
38	5	3) Regarding weeds, particularly knapweed, they are pervasive on the roads and creeping into logged areas off the roads. We encourage both biological and chemical control. If weeds are controlled, wildlife will benefit from native grasses and forbes, and recreation will be enhanced.

Com- ment #	Para- graph	Comment
38	6	4) Regarding camping along Fish Creek: In addition to the two proposed developed campgrounds, consider allowing continued dispersed camping along the creek, with signs or barriers to protect areas close to the creek.
39	1	I whole-heartedly support MT FWP moving forward on the Fish Creek Project and purchasing the 41,000 acres of available land from The Nature Conservancy. I think this is a great opportunity to protect vital fish and wildlife habitat. I applaud the agency for pursuing, and The Nature Conservancy for presenting, this opportunity.
39	2	However, I oppose the option of designating part of the land for a State Park and building a developed camping site there. The construction of a developed camping facility will diminish the wildlife and fish habitat benefit. There are other, less intrusive options available for easing the pressure on the Alberton Gorge. I prefer that FWP take this opportunity to protect the Fish Creek Project land for the benefit of the fish and wildlife and explore other options to accommodate campers and floaters.
40	1	I have fished and hunted in the Fish Creek drainage for over 20 years. Since the first time I drove up Fish Creek road in the early 1990s, I have been struck by this watershed's ability to maintain two key attributes, despite having sustained heavy logging in the past: (1) the existence of wild, native, and sensitive species such as cutthroat and bull trout, and now gray wolves; and (2) its relatively undeveloped character, despite proximity to the population center of Missoula. Over the past two decades I have spent countless hours wandering various parts of the Fish Creek drainage, and have many fond memories of doing so. I intend to create more.
40	2	I have two main comments regarding the current proposal. First, my congratulations to the Department for arranging the purchase of the Plum Creek lands in the drainage. Public ownership is the best way to provide for the long-term restoration and health of these lands – many of which have suffered much abuse in the past – and to ensure they remain accessible to the public. I urge the Department to complete this purchase.
40	3	Second, I strongly urge the Department NOT to create a new state park on the purchased lands. Formal park status would impose unnecessary and burdensome new costs on the already-strapped state parks budget. Moreover, the development of park infrastructure such as developed campgrounds will destroy the current undeveloped character of the drainage, which is one of the primary things that draws so many of us to the Fish Creek area. It will be far preferable from a fiscal, recreational, and conservation standpoint to manage the area for dispersed recreation, as it currently is. This could be accomplished by creating a wildlife management area.
41		See pages A-31 to A-36
42		I would like to applaud you for considering the purchase of 41,000 acre's of land up fish Creek. However, fish creek popularity has increased significantly in the past several years. This is evident in decrease of wildlife and the number of permits for deer and elk that are issued in that area. From personal experience I can say the number of fish I regularly catch has decreased along with the quality of fish that I catch, this is very noticeable from even 5 years ago. There are already plenty of quality camp sites along fish creek. More access will only lead to more vandalism and more pollution to the creek along with more litter in the area. Please purchase the land but please do not turn it into a State Park that only benefits a few, yet jeopardizes the wildlife and the quality of the environment for all of us.
43		See pages A-37 to A-38
44	1	I am writing this letter to express support for the planned action for Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks (FWP) through funds available from the Access Montana Progran, the Habitat Montana Program and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Program to purchase lands currently owned by The Nature Conservancy with the intent of creating a wildlife management area (WMA), as well as a State Park on lands known as 'Fish Creek'. I express this support with some degree of reluctance, but I am convince, based on discussion at a meeting I attended in Superior, Montana on February 2, 2010, and on the materials distributed at that meeting, which I have reviewed thoroughly, that change for this area is inevitable. Though I believe purchase of this land by FWP and partners will accelerate that change, I hope the changes will progress in a positive direction.
44	2	My reluctance is based on the sensitive nature of the environment of Fish Creek. I am aware that this area is a primary habitat for bull trout and cutthroat trout, and believe that preservation of this habitat should be a primary objective. There are similar issues for the elk herds that inhabit this area, for at least part of the year.
44	3	The primary concerns I have fall into 4 broad categories;
44	4	1. The influx of people expected, based on creation of a WMA and State Park, should not adversely affect habitat for any of the animals currently inhabiting Fish Creek.
44	5	2. If the major draw for visitors to the area is Alberton Gorge, I believe the State Park should be placed in the area on the North side of I-90, in an effort to reduce traffic and impact of those visitors on Fish Creek proper.

Com- ment #	Para- graph	Comment
44	6	3. The road through Fish Creek is not in a condition sufficient to support additional traffic that might come from creation of a State Park and WMA. In addition, I do understand that purchase of this area by FWP and partners will not reduce taxes paid to Mineral County (approximately \$50,000 annually), but I believe the real tax issue is that Mineral County residents should not be expected to shoulder a greater tax burden for maintenance of roads throughout the Fish Creek area than they have shouldered prior to creation of the WMA and State Park. The tax year 2009 should be used as a basis for taxes earmarked for upkeep of this area. Additional funds for maintenance of this area, if outside the State Park and WMA, should be sought from other sources, as necessary. According to the environmental assessment provided at the Superior meeting, Mineral County can expect little positive financial impact from creation of the State Park and WMA, but that creation should not result in a greater financial burden for Mineral County residents.
44	7	4. While there was some talk of establishing more trails designated for OHVs in the Fish Creek area, my research would indicate that there are sufficient OHV trails in areas near, but not in Fish Creek to support this activity. I am very much against designating such trails in Fish Creek. Again, this is a sensitive area from an environmental perspective, and potentially adverse influences, as I think OHV trails would be, should be eliminated, as much as possible.
45		I have looked over the EA for the proposed Fish Creek land exchange, and I support the proposed alternative of going through with the land exchange as a long-term public benefit.
46	1	I attended the meeting in Superior on 2/2/10 and I am thrilled that you are wanting to purchase the land around Fish Creek for the purposes of a Wildlife Management Area. Fish Creek is a very special place in Montana and should be protected as much as possible.
46	2	As happy as I am about your interest in the area, I also have some concerns.
46	3	Fish Creek is a sensitive area. The area has a "minimum of 182 wildlife species" including being the primary habitat for bull trout and cutthroat trout. Anything that is done must keep the wildlife's needs as a primary concern!
46	4	My concerns are.....
46	5	1. The increased number of people expected to visit and use the area must not adversely affect habitat for any of the animals currently inhabiting Fish Creek. My first choice a WMA with no state park and no campground. Is the <u>only</u> way FWP can purchase the land is to have a state park and campground?
46	6	2. If most of the visitors to the state park and campground are those folks visiting the area of the Alberton Gorge, why wouldn't we want the state park to be placed in the area on the North side of I-90, in an effort to reduce traffic and impact of those visitors on Fish Creek. Why put the state park in such a sensitive area--right where the trout will be migrating to/from the Clark Fork to Fish Creek?
46	7	If there <u>must</u> be a campground, does it have to be so large? I would request it be as small as possible to lessen the impact on the environment. Also, I would request it be a primitive campground like the others in the area. That <i>might</i> makes things a bit better for the wildlife. Once a campground is improved with electricity and water hook-ups, the traffic and use will be so much greater and the magic of Fish Creek will be lost.
46	8	3. The road through Fish Creek is not in any condition to handle additional traffic. It's currently impacting the stream and the effects will multiplied many times over with additional traffic caused by the installation of a state park and campground.
46	9	4. I am very concerned about the trash and refuse left by the potential increased number of visitors. And I am even more concerned about the increased need for law enforcement that will not be met.
46	10	5. I am <u>adamantly</u> opposed to the creation of trails designated for OHVs in the Fish Creek area as discussed at the 2/2/10 meeting. I understand why ATV riders would like to have trails created so they don't have to share roads with dirt bikes, cars and trucks. But what about the riders of dirt bikes and motorcycles? Wouldn't everyone like to have their own road or trail created just for them? Fact is, there are already miles and miles of road for these vehicles to travel in the National Forest. And while some folks might respect the special trails and use them properly, there are many that won't. Then we would have OHV's in critical places that will harm wildlife and facilitate soil erosion. Not to mention the noise and air pollution. Would the OHV trails be for the greater good? It would not. All motorized vehicles must share the currently established roads.
47		Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the purposed purchase of 41 thousand acres of TNC land in the fish creek area as a long time user of fish creek I feel very confident that you and your crew at FWP will manage this land to its greatest ability. I especial like the idea of a large public use park, fish creek sure needs more camping available.
48	1	I am a fisheries consultant in W. Montana and an avid outdoorsman. I love all things recreation in the state of Montana and have spent all my 32 years here enjoying it. I am writing this in regard to the proposed land acquisition in the Fish Creek drainage.. I believe this is a great concept to help insure that Montana's public can continue to enjoy all the Fish Creek drainage in its splendor. However, I believe the concept of the 7000 acre state park is the wrong idea for the area. I think the creation of something like this would be a determent to the surrounding area and the public that enjoys it. It would also be a determent to the wildlife, both terrestrial and aquatic, that call that drainage home.

Com- ment #	Para- graph	Comment
48	2	I believe a 7000 acre park would encourage much more traffic in the area subsequently disrupting wildlife patterns of use and migration. It would also lend itself to increased fishing pressure in an area that is considered a stronghold for native fish, both Westslope Cutthroat and Bull Trout. By-catch in these areas may increase markedly as a result. I also believe that it would also increase traffic from ORV users. This would also disrupt wildlife use in these areas and subsequently affect hunting use by the public of the area. I believe hunting use in this drainage would decrease as many folks currently use the excuse of hunting to go spend some quality time in the outdoors either with close friends or family and purposefully go to undeveloped areas like Fish Creek to get away from other human influences. I would ask that public hunting prerogative be maintained in its current state of freedom and that restrictions not be imposed to regulate it further, perhaps with the exception of a buffer area that would protect any developed areas. These are some of the concerns I have for the future management of the Fish Creek drainage. I do believe as a whole this would be a good project and potentially greatly benefit both state resources and the public that enjoys to recreate in these areas.
49	1	I am very pleased that the state has purchased Plum Creek Timber Co lands in the Fish Creek Drainage. I have watched the water quality and wildlife habitat decline in the last 25 years that I have fished and hiked in the area. I remember fishing during spring runoff in the 1980's and it was one of a few streams in the area that ran clear. Today that is no longer the case.
49	2	It is very forward thinking for the state to acquire these lands as we see PCTC selling off their property for dispersed home site developments. As such, it seems contrary to then go ahead and develop large recreational developments (campgrounds, etc). If there is increased usage of rafting in the Alberton Gorge area, then develop recreational sites along that corridor and leave the Fish Creek area for low intensity use, i.e. hiking, hunting and fishing, and preserve the wildlife and fish habitat.
49	3	Thanks for the opportunity to comment on this proposal, and again, thanks for purchasing these properties.
50		See pages A-39 to A-40
51	1	The purpose of this email is to respond the request for comments regarding the Fish Creek EA. I am very much in favor of the proposal as presented the February 2nd meeting in Superior. I feel the state park is a critical element in the proposal and will provide maximum beneficial opportunity to the public and local economy. I feel the location of the campground on the Rivulet bench west of Fish Creek will mitigate the concerns currently expressed. I feel the acquisition of this property by the state is the first and major concern. Also, the projected 3 year planning period to finalize the management plan will provide ample opportunity to mitigate concerns regarding the various proposed management scenarios. I also feel that this is the time to build a campground. The economy is such that jobs are needed and many materials are at a low point in reference to cost. There is also ample opportunity for alternative funding given the stimulus attitude at the federal levels.
51	2	I appreciate the innovative future based "thinking" of Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks. This is a bold move that is only feasible because of the cooperative approach between FWP and Parks you have chosen. While Mineral County is already heavily encumbered with public land, you provide the opportunity to return this abundance of public land from a liability to the status of an asset. The fact that you will pay taxes on this ownership mitigates a potentially harmful situation for the beleaguered tax base of our county. Also in your EA you state that you will take care of law enforcement and SAR tasks.
51	3	I would appreciate your consideration of the following proposal in your future dealings regarding the issue of land consolidations between managing state entities, namely the DNRC. If any land is to be swapped between FWP and DNRC, would you please present the idea of trading a portion of the Fish Creek Acquisition for the DNRC parcel of approx 160 acres in N 1/2 of the west 1/2 of Section 02 T16N R26W (GeoCode 5425240220101000), formerly known as the "Sportsman's Club". The purpose of this would be to develop a Multi-faceted Shooting Sports and Recreation Facility for Mineral County and Regional residents. The group that is forming would then apply for grant funds to lease or purchase these lands from FWP. This would ensure the longevity of his volunteer effort and would provide a strong foundation for the presence of a full service facility for the purpose of hosting safety education and recreational opportunity to the public. At present there is no facility of this nature within the county. The hindrance has been the difficulty of finding a place where this kind of facility could be constructed. There have been many swaps between the variety of public land management entities, yet there has been little if any direct benefit to the residents of Mineral County. Even this current effort will be of more benefit to the greater public than to the residents of Mineral County.

Com- ment #	Para- graph	Comment
51	4	During the wildlife portion of the presentation there was mentioned an area closure for the sake of providing security for a beleaguered elk herd. There was no mention of the exponential increase in the WOLF population that has decimated the elk and deer populations of the county. It is time that this predator population be recognized for what it is and that it be dealt with accordingly. Stop blaming the human population that hunts, for the grave errors of the human population that introduced the foreign wolves. There were wolves here before the introduction and there was balance, they fit, it worked. Now the introduced wolves are not exhibiting normal pack behavior and it is out of hand. So now we have no more cow tags, of any significant number, or any deer B tags and it is certainly not because of the high hunter harvest rates. There are hundreds of gates and hundreds of miles of wilderness, inventoried roadless areas, and other such closures all in the name of wildlife security on the 82% of the county that is federal. The locals refer to the federal land as the King's Land and when the notion of public is mentioned the response is "which public". I really hate to see the state fall into the same attitude, we don't need more restrictions and the denial of access to more lands. Mineral County is already an amenity for the few, given the federal management methodology and philosophy. The State of Montana should be a model for the Forest Service to follow rather than falling in line behind them. This is the main reason the residents of the county were and are so adamant about No More Federal Land in Mineral County and why the state was the preferred entity to acquire this land. Please don't turn this state acquisition into exclusionary land grab that only furthers the national park attitude of US Forest Service.
51	5	Please consider this input as full endorsement of the EA as presented, with due consideration to the previous paragraph. A summary of my input is as follows:
51	6	• I strongly support the Montana Fish Wildlife and Parks acquisition of the TNC Fish Creek Property.
51	7	• I strongly support the 7,000+ acre State Park near the mouth of Fish Creek. This includes campgrounds, OHV area, Equestrian amenities, and fishing access.
51	8	• I am opposed to denying people access for the sake of wildlife security without addressing the genuine cause for the decline of the ungulate population, the wolf.
51	9	• I am opposed to the denying of access and closing off more land given the thousands of acres in the county that are already locked up under federal ownership.
52	1	The notion of securing much of Fish Creek as public property is a good one, and I can foresee a time when the area will become even more important as a dispersed recreation and wildlife area to the Missoula community than it already is.
52	2	I'm not so sure a State Park there would be high on my list of places to spend much money, but I think that if it is at least part of the public domain, future generations could assess that plan. Thanks for listening,
53	1	As a nearby residents, my Wife and I fish Fish Creek and it tributaries and hike throughout the Fish Creek drainage. We are both amazed and thankful that we have this beautiful and unique area a few miles from our home.
53	2	We strongly support the purchase of the Nature Conservancy lands by Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks and the creation of a State Park and Wildlife Management Area. We believe that this purchase will not only protect and preserve this special part of Montana, but will provide the opportunity to improve the fishery and wildlife in Fish Creek and throughout the Fish Creek drainage. This improvement will enhance outdoor opportunities and attract Montana and out of State visitors who will bring much needed dollars into the local economy.
53	3	We both were fearful just a few years ago that the Plum Creek Timber Company would market and sell the valuable Fish Creek frontage for residential use, destroying public access and the priceless fish and wildlife habitat. Our thanks both to The Nature Conservancy for purchasing this land from Plum Creek and to Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks for the forward thinking proposal of a State Park and Wildlife Management area. Present and future Montanans will forever be thankful for your foresight and efforts.
54		Hi, I support the FishCree drainage though not the big state park. Drawing so much concentrated (or in any otherkind) recreation to this region would not only affect the park but all the surrounding area. I think it should be all or nothing, not both; and clearly, all-state-park escapes our budget abilities. Thank you.
55		I fully support this purchase.
56	1	I strongly support the FWP public acquisition of 41,000 acres in the Fish Creek drainage. However, the proposed 7,000 acre state park is excessively large and should be significantly reduced in acreage while the Wildlife Management Area should be increased in acreage.
56	2	A large state park will mean increased pressure from multiple activities such as off road vehicle (ORV) recreation and developed facilities, which have been shown to cause significant impacts to deer and elk behavior, reproduction, and survival. A state park will also likely be focused on recruiting nonresident visitors at the expense of local citizens who would prefer to use the area in its undeveloped state.
56	3	A larger Wildlife Management Area is a better solution because it would focus on maintaining and restoring Fish Creek's fish and wildlife values for the benefit of the public regardless of most external pressures. This can clearly be seen in the primary goal of Montana's WMAs, which is to "maintain vital wildlife habitat for the protection of species and the enjoyment of the public."
56	4	The state park should be just large enough to facilitate a campground in the northernmost portion of the proposed purchase area south of Interstate 80

Com- ment #	Para- graph	Comment
56	5	FWP should only allow Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on open road systems for both the state park and the WMA. An ORV trail network would negatively impact fish and wildlife habitat and hunting and fishing.
56	6	I encourage FWP to retain an open public hunting policy for the lands identified for the purchase and to not restrict public hunting in the purchase area, with the exception of a reasonable safety buffer for front-country facilities.
56	7	Thanks you for considering these comments:
57	1	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Fish Creek Environmental Assessment. The authors of the Fish Creek EA did an excellent job identifying the need and objectives for the purchase of nearly 41,000 acres in the Fish Creek drainage. The cataloging of vegetation, wildlife and fisheries species is thorough and compelling. The potential for recreation opportunities are abundant under proposed state ownership and management of the former Plum Creek lands.
57	2	As citizens who live approximately 20 miles east of Fish Cree, our primary interest include:
57	3	1) Increased public protection of lands adjacent and connected to the Alberton Gorge.
57	4	2) Wildlife corridor connectivity with our Nine Mile Valley.
57	5	3) Sustained management of forested lands.
57	6	We occasionally enjoy white water rafting down the Alberton Gorge. Our last trip was guided by a young woman who works summers for the family-owned business in Superior. Included in our raft were a son, daughter-in-law and two grandsons who currently live in Phoenix. The day was spectacular, with our knowledgeable guide providing interesting natural history lessons along the way. A nice long pause at Fish Creek was particularly enjoyable; what a beautiful location where the creek enters the Clark Fork River.
57	7	Establishing an approximately 6,900 acre state park as part of the FWP management of the former Plum Creek lands would improve and increase recreational opportunities south of the Clark Fork River. Development and maintenance of camp grounds, hiking and equestrian trails, and fishing access sites promise improved and quiet (non-motorized) access to Fish Creek's natural recreational resources.
57	8	As longtime residents of the Nine Mile Valley, we especially appreciate the opportunity of living alongside numerous species of wildlife, including deer, wolves, mountain lions, moose, elk, coyotes, turkey and grouse. Ensuring forest carnivore linkage zones between our Nine Mile Divide and the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness is of great importance. Maintenance of critical bull trout and Westslope cutthroat trout habitat and protection on winter range used by multiple species are also high importance to our household.
57	9	Finally, Plum Creek unfortunately pursued short-term corporate goals in terms of managing their Montana timber properties. Clear-cut than sell should be the corporate motto. Under state management, adjacent communities reliant on a timber-based economy can expect long-term, sustainable timer supplies form these acres.
58		See pages A-41 to A-46
59	1	When I moved to Missoula in 1970 I had the good fortune to become acquainted with the Fish Creek drainage and surrounding areas. From that time until the present I've enjoyed the opportunity to fish the creeks and high mountain lakes, to day-hike and backpack the rugged backcountry, to pack in on livestock, to hunt big game, trap furbearers, cut firewood, kayak and raft the Clark Fork River Gorge. During these years I also led high school aged students on educational summer backpack trips along the Idaho-Montana divide and assisted with a masters degree mountain lion study. Each year, however, I noted the change to the resource as roads were built and timber was harvested. I had mixed feelings about this place I had enjoyed so much and invested so much time in.
59	2	Now, however, a special opportunity has arrived for the people of Montana to acquire much of this resource to be held and managed for future generations. This land will come back when managed by FWP, something which will not happen if it is sold to the private sector. Therefore, Mack, I am excited about and earnestly support the acquisition of these lands and hopefully look forward with others to utilizing this beautiful country for many years into the future.
60	1	I strongly support the FWP public acquisition of 41,000 acres in the Fish Creek drainage.
60	2	However, the proposed 7,000 acre state park is excessively large and should be significantly reduced in acreage while the Wildlife Management Area should be increased in acreage.
60	3	A large state park will mean increased pressure from multiple activities such as off road vehicle (ORV) recreation and developed facilities, which have been shown to cause significant impacts to deer and elk behavior, reproduction, and survival. A state park will also likely be focused on recruiting nonresident visitors at the expense of local citizens who would prefer to use the area in its undeveloped state.
60	4	A larger Wildlife Management Area is a better solution because it would focus on maintaining and restoring Fish Creek's fish and wildlife values for the benefit of the public regardless of most external pressures. This can clearly be seen in the primary goal of Montana's WMAs, which is to "maintain vital wildlife habitat for the protection of species and the enjoyment of the public."
60	5	The state park should be just large enough to facilitate a campground in the northernmost portion of the proposed purchase area south of Interstate 80
60	6	I encourage FWP to only allow Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on open road systems for both the state park and the WMA. An ORV trail network would negatively impact fish and wildlife habitat and hunting and fishing.

Com- ment #	Para- graph	Comment
60	7	I also encourage FWP to retain an open public hunting policy for the lands identified for the purchase and to not restrict public hunting in the purchase area, with the exception of a reasonable safety buffer for front-country facilities.
61		i strongly support the fish creek purchase, but with a reduced state park. a larger wma is a better solution for hunters and hikers, and wildlife itself. i encourage fwp's to allow orv's to the existing open road system only. i believe that to large of a state park with uncontrolled orv use would have negative impact on wildlife and habitat. i would also encourage fwp to allow public hunting in the wma.
62		As a hunter and angler who has spent significant time in the entire Fish Creek Drainage, I strongly support the FWP public acquisition of 41,000 acres in the Fish Creek. However, I do think the proposed 7,000 acre state park is excessively large and should be significantly reduced in acreage while the Wildlife Management Area should be increased in acreage. A large state park will mean increased pressure from multiple activities such as off road vehicle (ORV) recreation and developed facilities, which have been shown to cause significant impacts to deer and elk behavior, reproduction, and survival. A state park will also likely be focused on recruiting nonresident visitors at the expense of local citizens who would prefer to use the area in its undeveloped state. A larger Wildlife Management Area is a better solution because it would focus on maintaining and restoring Fish Creek's fish and wildlife values for the benefit of the public regardless of most external pressures. This can clearly be seen in the primary goal of Montana's WMAs, which is to "maintain vital wildlife habitat for the protection of species and the enjoyment of the public." The state park should be just large enough to facilitate a campground in the northernmost portion of the proposed purchase area south of Interstate 90. I encourage FWP to only allow Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on open road systems for both the state park and the WMA. An ORV trail network would negatively impact fish and wildlife habitat and hunting and fishing. I encourage FWP to retain an open public hunting policy for the lands identified for the purchase and to not restrict public hunting in the purchase area, with the exception of a reasonable safety buffer for front-country facilities.
63	1	I am commenting on the FWP proposal of the State Park and WMA in the Fish creek drainage. First off I would like to thank FWP personal that have been working on this project. Also like to thank Vicki Edwards, Lee Bastian, Mike Thompson and Mack Long for returning my calls and answering my questions the best they could through this process. I have been living in Fish Creek and have worked in Fish Creek for a number of years outfitting, guiding and managing Hole in the Wall Lodge, my wife also lives and works in the Fish Creek drainage. We love this area and county and enjoy all it has to offer. When Plum Creek Timber Company sold the land to TNC we wondered who would be the best steward of the land and protect all its history and culture? As I write this comment I am still not sure to be quite honest. After many sleepless nights I realize there probably is no perfect land steward. I will also admit until this process started I have not had much experience with FWP lands. When you live in such a great place there is not much need to. Some of the things I have learned and are concerned with would be the following.
63	2	When you start up a business and go to a financial institution to get the finances the investors usually want to see a business plan, know your goals and how you will pay for it. In this case the public would be your investors since this is being funded with public dollars. I have attended the meetings and read the documents and have not seen a breakdown on this and it worries me. There are roads that are in poor shape, a county that emergency services are stressed, and as a Fish Creek resident I don't want the troubles of a poorly managed State Park or WMA. Yes you will be required to pay taxes but again it is public money that you will use to pay them with. From my understanding the majority of the tax money will go to the Alberton school district. Our emergency services including our game warden do an excellent job but they are stretched thin as it is. I think there should be an access fee that would go to the county from these Fish Creek lands. I do not think having a State Park and WMA is going to be a big economic driver for our county. We try to do the majority of our business locally. I see a lot of people who come to Fish Creek whether it is fishing, hunting, hiking, or rafting. They come from either Missoula or Spokane and stop for recreation but have purchased all there necessities before they have come here which is understandable, Superior and Alberton can not offer what the big towns have and are not close to Fish Creek. I feel like a lot of the citizens questions have not been answered. I would like to see that you have a solid plan in place before I could feel comfortable fully supporting this.
63	3	I am against the closure of appendix F. First off I cannot see using public funds to tell the (non motorized) public they cannot go into the area. I have not spent much time in the Burdette winter range but from the traffic I see on the road I don't believe there should be a lot of pressure in that area that time of year Dec1-May14th. I would assume after you have owned the land and had a concern that the wildlife was stressed because of the public then you might tell the public your concerns and see if there is a solution, instead you are starting with closures right off the bat. In a winter range I would think the predators stress the wildlife ten time more as someone hiking, hunting or trapping the predators, I also believe that this drainage has to many lions, bears and wolves and until there is some predators harvested there may not be many animals that make it to that range. Predator stress is 24/7 unlike human caused stress.

Com- ment #	Para- graph	Comment
63	4	Also, I don't agree with your commercial use rules. Commercial use has had a history on this landscape and is part of Mineral Counties cultural values. I believe TNC bought this land to protect and preserve the cultural values, public access and manage the land for timber harvest. We are permitted on TNC lands that FWP intends to purchase and under your rules may not be able to continue to use. I ask you to manage your lands case by case. I don't believe you can manage Mount Jumbo WMA that is 120 acres under the same rules, as you would manage Fish Creek WMA and State Park, which is over 40,000 acres. I would believe you would use the right management tools for the right lands and that maybe you should look to see if you have the right tools to manage this land before you enter into a purchase agreement. This is a great concern to me, if there is a need for a "guided public" service now and you turn this land into a State Park and WMA there will be an even a greater need. There are a lot of people who will come into this area and not have the means, knowledge or capabilities to enjoy it and that is what we offer. I ask you to find a balance on this landscape for this. Gordon Hendrick Montana House District 14 Representative has told me that he also supports continued commercial use on this landscape. This landscape also has a tradition of firewood gathering and this should also continue, firewood gathering could be a great land management tool for you on 40,000 acres!
63	5	As far as the extensive road system goes I would also not like to see the road system decommissioned. I am fine with gated roads or seasonal closures on some roads the way it is right now. It does not make sense to me to decommission or rip roads. This is a tool on this landscape for you to manage fire suppression and possible make trail systems and loops like what has been talked about in your State Park and WMA. The damage of the roads being built is evident it will not be in its natural state ever again. I am not a big supporter of ATVs. Unfortunately it is the one rider out of one hundred that give them a bad name. On the other hand they are a user group in this drainage. We have seen a lot more ATVs in the past 5-10 yrs in this county. Even though I am not for ATVs I do believe there can be a place for them. On that note probably a place for all user groups.
63	6	I would also like for the Fish Creek working group to continue and help guide the stewards of this land.
63	7	I do believe there is a great need for the campgrounds and think if they are properly managed would be a great asset and would help you fund this project. Although I am not sure Whitetail Flats would be a great spot for this. If this is going to cater to the whitewater traffic of the Alberton Gorge I would like to see it located in a better spot, the road after the bridge is narrow and steep and will cause problems. Also it is to far from the Gorge. The equestrian camp looks like a good location just would wonder where the water for horses would come from?
63	8	I remember the first meeting I attended in Alberton, when it was first unveiled that FWP may buy the land, the FWP personal had very big, proud smiles on there faces I could tell they were excited. Looking back on that meeting now I know what I looked like when I first came to Fish Creek. I am not sure what will happen in the months and years to come I can tell that whom ever does purchase the lands in Fish Creek I will try to do my best to work hand in hand with them.
63	9	Again I would like to Thank FWP personal that has worked on this Fish Creek Proposal.
64	1	Brief synopsis and opinion(s)
64	2	After review and study of your EA documents as presented by the FWP of Region 2 headquarters of Missoula, Montana and dated January 20 th , 2010 for the sole purpose and the intent for the purchase of the 41,000 acres from the Nature Conservancy, it is my opinion that the purchase of the entire said property should be purchased for an area of WMA, but not utilized for a seven thousand acre plus Park.
64	3	Some of your information as presented is bias and certainly shows complete incompetence when trying to sell the public on an idea without substantial back-up to prove the cause worthy and without complete facts of which to substantiate a park with-in the pristine area of the 41,000 acre area.
64	4	To convince this County and the tax payers that it is in the best interest to allow for the entire purchase based on the facts that you have three independent funding sources to make the purchase is one thing, but to sell the idea that the Park is an "Economic Driver", this is not in the best interest of the Mineral County tax payer or the State tax payer, period!
64	5	Let's recapture the just of this EA and please note:
64	6	In a summary letter sent to the Region 2 supervisor Mack Long by our dubious county commissioners thanking the FW&P for meeting with the commissioners and some concerned public tax payers on 12 / 23 / 09, it was duly stated and noted that it was <i>the county's conclusion and was unanimously in favor of this proposal for FW&P taking ownership of the Fish Creek property rather than federal control or the possibility of the TNC selling to private individuals .-quote .</i> It also stated- <i>we wanted to be assured of promoting fish and wildlife habitat as well as sustained tax base revenue.- quote.</i>
64	7	As a concerned citiizen and tax payer to this country, county and community I really need to point out some concerns, bias in the report and some misleading information that requires additional <u>transparency</u> by the FW&P:
64	8	(The magic word now days-transparency!)
64	9	● It has been pointed out numerous times in the EA that if the purchase by the FW&P of the said 41,000 acre parcel from the Nature Conservancy is <u>not</u> forthcoming, then the public faces the possibility of the Conservancy selling its property to "private concerns" for development and possibily prohibiting the use of this land?

Com- ment #	Para- graph	Comment
64	10	Let me first comment and interject and describe the intent and scope that the TNC of who they are and their supposed objective-
64	11	<i>"The TNC is a charitable environmental organization working to preserve the plants & animals and the natural communities that represent the diversity of life and earth by protecting the very lands & waters that are needed to survive."</i> -quote
64	12	The TNC has been operating under this surname since 1950 and is the third largest non-profit by assets and America's largest environmental non-profit by assets and revenue. The Nature Conservancy is headed by Mark Tercek former managing director of "Goldman Sachs"! (<i>scary! Yes, the Goldman-Sachs another saved entity by the American tax payer</i>)
64	13	Opinion to fact- remember that the original 320,000 acres of which this 41,000 acre is in part of from the sale of Plum Creek property to TNC @ \$1,593.00 per acre / \$510 million and now being offered / sold to the FWP @ \$342.00 per acre again all @ the tax payers expense. We already own the property.
64	14	Question: <i>If the TNC should sell to the private party does all of the sale money go back to the paying public now that the TNC is <u>not</u> living up to the original purchase agreement?</i>
64	15	<i>After all, "the purchase was made to ensure that the idea was to keep a productive forest, clean water, abundant fish & wildlife, while promoting continued access for hiking, hunting, fishing and other recreational opportunities."</i> -quote
64	16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continuing on regarding TNC sales- yes, the possibility of property for sale to private is very much a realism, but if the due diligences had been performed to a level of understanding in regards by the FW&P's to the geographics, demographics and our new planning ordinances studied and with the helpful input of our planner Mr. Tim Read it is very much for certain this will not be bought for subdivision property based on cost criteria to include paving standards, general construction costs, power, wetland issues and the winter ingress/egress. Just to name a few.
64	17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the existing private property owners of the Fish Creek valley were or had been interviewed properly and individually or collectively, the FW&P would find out that those of us who agree or disagree with the purchase are hunters, fisherman and respect this land, wildlife to such a degree we all go out of our way to enhance the wildlife and give added mitigation opportunities for the wildlife when ever possible.
64	18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Another issue has reared an ugly head in regards to the area of concern and not just the Park area in it's self. This is the rights of former and future landowners for deeded mineral rights of which both the TNC and FW&P's has acknowledged, but really has not mitigated to a level of confidence that this particular area will not be utilized in the future lawfully for many different reasons. You cannot mitigate a problem by looking the other way and deciding or declaring that there are no valuable minerals, because this right includes aggregate resources. This concern needs further study and satisfaction to the fullest before we take on this burden as the state FW&P's or Mineral County.
64	19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Secondly, if the Conservancy were to sell small or large portions of the 41,000 acres the County could and would reap more tax base funding based on land owner improvements rather than the typical agriculture/forest tax base revenue as predicated by the 50k per year received now. So what I am saying that this is just a few reason(s) not to allow anyone of us to be convinced by a scare tactic that this purchase should happen. Your tax dollars already paid for this land once and now again? Let's think about that carrot that does <u>not</u> need to be dangled by the FW&P's!
64	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Also remember the original 20 people in the consortium that was chosen to represent the Fish Creek area with the Conservancy only (2) or 10% were actually Fish Creek property owners.
64	21	I also want to point out to the public that the FWP has the authority to purchase land by the Montana Statute 87-1-209. Which means - <i>to purchase suitable lands for birds, game, and fish or fur bearing, animal restoration, propagation (i.e.- reproduction) or protection, for hunting, fishing or trapping.</i>
64	22	<i>Essentially the same valuable rhetoric as noted and stated by TNC.</i>
64	23	We as Montanans understand and typically support our FW&P's and Montana law and how it is written, but in this particular case why would we think about putting a 7,400 acre or 18.05% of a land purchase into a State Park in an area that is woefully in need of years of woodland restoration caused from fire, wildlife enhancement & other unmitigated concerns caused from the over exposure of wolf habitat that we cannot yet seem to manage?
64	24	The FW&P's has 2.5 pages of birds, animals listed as (SOC) <i>Species of Concern</i> or (PSOC) <i>Possible Species of Concern</i> and now we are thinking about more vehicular traffic, human intervention, noise pollution, garbage in the immediate areas of concern that will cause unjust concerns / issue to the wildlife and property?
64	25	Some facts that surround the circumstances to this proposed Park area by purchase of the 41k acres.
64	26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3.5 miles of the existng roadway from 1-90 needs improved to handle such traffic, nic law enforcement, signage and guardrail to meet MDOT specification and standard public safety requirements.
64	27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The roadway from the Rivulet Bridge to the top of the hill approx. ½ mile
64	28	Plus @ 11.0% grade and 1.5 lanes with no guard rail. w/ .5:1:00 slopes transversing 50-150 ft. Vertically.
64	29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some of the County roadway property on the Rivulet Road has already slid into Fish Creek in the past and the St.Clair ranch graciously allowed land to be used by the County to save Mineral County costs of constructing new roadway around the slide area. This is not likely to happen for roadway widening in the future to meet these new standards.

Com- ment #	Para- graph	Comment
64	30	● Mineral County cannot afford sheriff patrol
64	31	● Mineral County cannot afford garbage patrol
64	32	● Mineral County cannot afford roadway maintenance or wintertime needs.
64	33	● This area of this magnitude will only serve as a breeding ground for unsolicited partying without control for our youth and out of staters that choose to violate the law. We already have far too much of this uncontrolled disturbance in this area too include all of Fish Creek.
64	34	● The existing private land owners are already interrupted by the out of area people to help fix tires, out of gas, drunks and wrecks nic all of the garbage that our frontage road and entrance roads @ the state highway has incurred by truckers and these individuals that lack respect for the land or themselves.
64	35	● Now, by your own admittance to understand you have no idea of future costs, stating that it will not be manned by your group, but yet you know there is no plan for any of the above mentioned issues to be mitigated to a full respectful understanding to make sure Mineral County and the adjacent landowners are completely satisfied is absurd.
64	36	I know full well and I understand that the FW&P has a rebuttal to include an obligation by the Montana law 87-1-201 MCA- which requires the FW&P's to contribute to a special revenue account called the <i>"forest management account"</i> .
64	37	(this amount is designated @ \$300K, but as duly noted it is to be used for: <i>fire mitigation, beetle infestation, wildlife enhancement, weed control, fencing, garbage, public health & safety. Riparian repair etc.</i>)
64	38	What this law does not state in this report is how much of the 300K will, when, how much and how often these funds are to be distributed for use in the Fish Creek area. Most importantly who sets these priorities and who sets these above mentioned management goals or gets to set those goals or disagree with the priority and distribution of funds?
64	39	Is the 300K a one time investment from the State Parks for years of supposed shared burden? We know the answer is yes, but 300K is a drop in the bucket for a proposed park of this size to be maintained and managed no matter the location, but this money is to be utilized for all of the 41k acres so it will go quickly.
64	40	I believe we already know that Mineral County and especially those living with-in the area will not have a vote on distribution or priority.
64	41	<i>(This is actually 2% contrubution based on these numbers for the 14.5 million purchase for years to come? It is not enough to meet all of the requirements that Mineral County will need to host this Park area or continued management of the entire purchase)</i>
64	42	Please understand that I believe that the overall purchase of Fish Creek should be in the State hands and our FW&P's, but first the FW& P's needs to consider investing the tax payer money or any funding into just a WMA as described. If this means changing some historical practices for the good of the area, then make the changes.
64	43	The FW&P's or any government entity should never consider development in an area of such devastation and allow public free reign with-out proper management or design that would not take into account all the proper attributes concerning public safety and health for years to come.
64	44	Above all else in todays economic world the tax payers and specifically the Mineral County tax payers should never be burden with such an idea that this proposed park could and would not create a few long term jobs and could not pay for it self by allowing for day or weekly charges to the people that utilize this facility or Fish Creek proper.
64	45	You have stated that all collected funds will go to the State coffers and be re-allocated which means Mineral County again will be under funded for such a project.
64	46	Please remember that our Montana people will not be paying any or very little of a fee(s) based on dollars collected by your Parks Division when we pay for our Montana vehicle license. This means that the percentage of earned revenue has gone down considerably and your supposed Economic Driver for the area is not only gone, but the survival of the Park based on your Economic Driver funding will most likely be a failure.
64	47	A facility of this magnitude and the needs required by the people that would want to utilize the area the most, as stated in the report is the Alberton gorge adventurers. The requirements would be toilets, fire rings, hydrants, sewer disposal, gabage outlets, easy ingress/ egress parking for large motor homes/trailers etc., all necessary to bring the people to the area that want to come back, yet leave it in the condition it was found!- reputable people!
64	48	I know as a general contractor / construction manager who has built State and County Parks in the great state of Washington that were worth millions of dollars and now my company is contracted with the Federal government to build a park in Ennis, Montana, I fully understand all of the required amenties and understand the needs for day use charges. I positively for a fact know what a Park like this would cost to the tee and the management costs as well. This proposed park area if designed and built correctly to the value that would be suitable for Mineral County, it would be very costly for all of the improvement in this particular area. This is not to mention again the aforementioned unstability for the proposed betterment of the wildlife?

Com- ment #	Para- graph	Comment
64	49	This Park and area would be better suited and built if it were next to I-90, off of the Fish Creek exit to the north where it would best be seen, easily marketed by state signage and utilized for and by the majority of the users of Fish Creek/Alberton gorge. This would also give a better opportunity for the tax payers investment to be paid for and certainly closer for the sheriff or state patrol to monitor, less cost for infrastructure, and most importantly less wildlife intervention and certainly less fire issues all resulting in an ROI (return on investment) which would allow for the survival of the Park , better situation for the Fish Creek area as a whole, but most importantly no future tax program to fund the Park. To keep Fish Creek and the entire area the way we see it today would only allow for the FW&P's to show case their talent and knowledge bringing even a greater respect among the locals. Do not make the mistakes like the previous owners and pretend to be good stewards of the land.
64	50	Now, just looking at all of the known factors that I personally know to be needed to this degree, assuming all factors are taken into accordance based on the Montana law and standards mentioned above, I believe this Park area would be far cheaper to build then the area in Fish Creek.
64	51	I had recently spoke with my clients about the 63 acres plus and the add'l 11 acres located on the Alberton gorge on the north side of the Fish Creek entrance. They conveyed that they made an offer considerably less to the FW&P's, but when I had mentioned this to Mr. Bastian the Parks manager, he said the same offer was made as previously. That is not a fact, but only another opportunity to placate some of the public into thinking once again he may have done his job? I know different and factually this did not happen. He did in fact tell my wife and I that if the public did not want the Park where he wants its, then he can take the money and spend it on the East side! I say spend it on the East side if you think that you can tell the public in an open forum that we will all be involved and work together, but individually tell us that if he does not get his way then he won't play!!
64	52	Fact: The FW&P's was offered on January 18 th , 2010 almost two weeks prior to the Superior meeting on February 2 nd , 2010 a property deal for the 63 acres and the 11 acre Trestle Creek property located directly on the Alberton gorge. This property was now offered for 50 percent less than a year ago.
64	53	<i>This is why this property makes sense to build the Park in this area based on costs to include purchase, development and most important an ROI. All for the reasons previously mentioned. It will be much cheaper than the required improvements to the proposed 7,400 acre Park with-in the 41K acre piece.</i>
64	54	<i>The rough roadway improvements have been made, 120 GPM well drilled. You could easily build 100 sites for campers, trailers. Motor coaches, trails to the Gorge and a equestrian area for horses to relax. Also oneway in and out with a an approved emergency exit. Much easier to supervise and manage.</i>
64	55	If the FW&P wants our valley, then allow Fish Creek to be this pristine valley that the report talks about, do not placate us here in Mineral County into believing that a Park is a good thing or that the remained ownership by TNC is a bad thing. Allow yourselves as the FW&P's to serve and perform to the highest degree that makes you the respectable people that I and most of the public believe that you are, manage this forest, wildlife and fisheries with more enforcement, better game management, work more with the private land owners to enhance wildlife and fisheries and be more visiability to the local area. This means that you give the Fish Creek area and Mineral County additional enforcement that can help with the one officer that we already respect and admire in Mr. Micheal Faggely. These are the real essentials!
64	56	This EA also talks about the energy and economic value it would bring to the area? Not so, it will cost more for local law enforcement and our court system. We receive no revenue or very little from the Alberton Gorge venturers because all of the local businesses are really not associated or linked into the specific area of purchase nor will they be.
64	57	To state: "that you might go into town every other day and have a beer and burger?" Be glad you are not a business owner and rely on these people to support your business.
64	58	I would strongly urge also that the existing businesses now operating in the Fish Creek area for hunting and fishing continue to be allowed to perform business as usual without any changes for these are the real economic stabilizers in the area and now pay a large tax to the Mineral County system, not day float trips, fisherman or campers.
64	59	Our guides are essential, the real promoters and protectors of our wildlife and fisheries. Their continued conservation efforts thru study and knowledge of the species thus allows for the mentoring of the hunters or fisherman and with these addititive measures gives them the best opportunities for <u>all</u> the right reasons to enjoy the great outdoors.
64	60	Although the St.Clair ranch is a big supporter of your Dept.(s), I would strongly suggest that the FW&P's take into account and heed to this advice and suggestions and if so, then my opinion would be to please purchase, but if the government beauracrats do not want to listen or include our ideas as a majority vote for our vested interest and your idea is to inundate Mineral County or the private residences with more problems then what we already have been burdened, please save your money and invest else where!
64	61	The EA in many ways contradict what the real purpose of Fish Creek is being bought for and saved. Please remind yourselves of the motto's by your own creed and the TNC.
64	62	Before I finish, everyone needs to understand and please remember that the Nature Conservancy still has a goal: <i>"to protect the resource value of the land while improving the habitat, while allowing access for hunting and fishing"</i> -quote

Com- ment #	Para- graph	Comment
64	63	<i>The TNC and Trout Unlimited have made limited improvements collectively in 2009 and Mineral County still receives approx. 50K per year.</i>
64	64	These opinions and suggestions are the consensus of all of the people that reside @ the St.Clair ranch and many that live in and around the Fish Creek valley. Please contact me with your comments and concerns so we can be assured that we are counted and heard. 406-722-3207.
64	65	<i>Note to other Fish Creek parties:</i>
64	66	<i>"Please do not forget that these people work for us, are to represent us as a majority and are to be accountable. Most important we all must realize that most of these people have never owned a business or had to be responsible to make money work properly or be responsible to the public for their errors, but it is time that they spend the tax payers dollars wisely, not because it is just there in a pot to spend!!"</i>
64	67	<i>It appears that the TNC has given the FW&P's a deadline to purchase, but no one is standing in line to purchase this property and we are being lead to believe that we need to hurry to purchase and this does not make sense.</i>
64	68	<i>It has come to my attention by a good source that once again the arrogance of our governor has once again appeared! It was understood for him to say in reference to the Ppark and purchase that this was already a "done deal".</i>
64	69	<i>Conclusion: I suspect that this is a formality in making all parties at the government level feel like they have done their job and our comments and / or suggestions from Mineral County and land owners will most likely be discounted or misplaced.</i>
64	70	Contact Mack Long so he can make a conscience decision on how our tax dollars are to be spent fiducially and accounted.
64	71	The St.Clair ranch will continue our stewardship at the ranch for wildlife, forest land and the <i>"historical preservation of the Andrew Garcia legacy"</i> .
65	1	I strongly support the FWP public acquisition of 41,000 acres in the Fish Creek drainage.
65	2	However, the proposed 7,000 acre state park is excessively large and should be significantly reduced in acreage while the Wildlife Management Area should be increased in acreage.
65	3	A larger state park will have significant impacts to deer and elk behavior, reproduction, and survival. I prefer the area be left in it's undeveloped state. The more facilities the more people the more pressure to wildlife. The state should consider the wildlife first and foremost.
65	4	The state park should be just large enough to facilitate a campground in the northernmost portion of the proposed purchase area south of Interstate 80
65	5	Please keep the ORV on established roads only for the protection of wildlife.
65	6	Hunting and fishing should be allowed with only a safety buffer around campgrounds.
66	1	As a hunter, fisherman and biologist I strongly support the 41,000 acre FWP acquisition in the Fish Creek Drainage. I do not support the excessively large proposal for the 7000 acre State Park. I request that the State Park be reduced to a campground and associated facilities in the lower portion of the drainage, and the WMA be enlarged accordingly.
66	2	I was District Ranger on the Ninemile Ranger District for 10 years, which has primary responsibility for managing National Forest lands in the Fish Creek drainage. In addition I was fish biologist and biological resource planner on the the Lolo for an additional 12 years. The proximity of a large State Park to the proposed Great Burn Wilderness invites user conflicts. This is especially true with the stated opportunity to create ORV trails and accomodate increases in such use. As travel plan leader in 1986, we on the Lolo worked hard to eliminate existing motorcycle use in the Great Burn area and reduce the motorized use in the Fish Creek drainage. These measures were done to preserve non-motorized recreation opportunities as well as reduce impacts to watersheds and wildlife and fish habitat, including bull trout. Later the Lolo closed the Great Burn proposed wilderness to snowmobile use. Mountain goat habitat is still adversely impacted by illegal motorized use. Trying to control illegal use would be more difficult as motorized use is encouraged by creation of facilities in an adjacent State Park.
66	3	Fish Creek is not only a essential spawning and rearing habitat for bull trout, but is also one of the few large spawning tributaries for trout into the lower Clark Fork.
66	4	Please move ahead, but move ahead wisely!
67	1	I would like to see the FWP purchase the Nature Conservancy lands in Fish Creek, Alberton Gorge and Nemote Ck as proposed.
67	2	I question the need for the Williams Peak Area proposal as a State Park. You can already use the area for hiking, riding (horses), skiing, fishing, hunting etc. without it being a state park. If some of the funding has to come from the park monies concentrate along the Gorge section as that is where the impact is greatest. Some funding could be used for purchase, lease, easements of property along the Gorge.

Com- ment #	Para- graph	Comment
67	3	With the concern about the large carnivore numbers and wanting them reduced, I don't see the sense in the proposed seasonal closure from Deer Ck. to Wig Ck. In all the years of following hounds I've noticed deer and elk just moving out of the way. Even while horn hunting these animals just move away. They don't seem to go running out of the country, especially once general hunting season is over. This proposal would also create a sanctuary for the large predators. These predators are being targeted already through longer seasons, more permits for reduction in numbers so why give them some more room to get away?
67	4	In reference to the above predatory reduction leave the roads up the main drainages open for travel. This is especially needed on the East side of Fish Ck.
67	5	The North boundary on the proposed seasonal closure area should be moved to the main ridge between Deer Ck and Wig Ck. to make it easier for lion hunters.
67	6	With Fish Ck being such a big drainage I don't think a seasonal closure area is needed with the burned areas recovering as they are.
68		I'm in full support of the Fish Creek property you are proposing to purchase, but I believe the primary emphasis on the ground should be wildlife and fisheries habitat and hunting and fishing. The state park size is too large and should be just big enough to accomodate a small campground on the northern portion. I also would encourage you to allow OHV use only on the existing road system. Please do not build new trails in this area.
69		See pages A-47 to A-49
70	1	I am in support of this acquisition. I feel you Objectives were right on track. I think you actually minimized the negative economic impacts land development in this area could have had on the residents of Mineral County.
70	2	I do feel you need to look at the animal security issues and keep roads closed as needed for this reason, especially in certain seasons, however allow for access on foot to all the areas and access by motorized with monitoring so as to not allow the rip and tear mentality but yet allow the family motorized outing. Wintertime snowmobile use should especially be allowed in most areas since this can be done without soil and water deterioration. I would like to see, I believe it may be one or two?, existing hunting guides business be able to operate in this area, park or no park. I would also like to see the option for livestock grazing be left open in case the request may come in future years. There are areas of this land deal that I feel FWP may want to trade out of in future years with either the USFS and DNRC to block lands up better for all parties concerned. Timber management is also an important issue to be considered for the future. At present, much restoration and weed control must be done, but in future years, as timber grows back, fwp needs to become a responsible timber manager as well as wildlife manager. Timber harvest must be left as an option for when the time is right. Long range vision. I also feel this area needs to be included in any wolf management and hunting area and not used as any sanctuary for them.
70	3	The main road is a very important area in need of work for water quality protection. This and weed control must be top priorities.
70	4	Overall, I am glad to see Alternative A so this parcel can be preserved for future generations to recreate in and maintain the protection of animal movement corridors.
71		I commend FWP for the planned purchase of land in the Fish Creek drainage. However, I am not in favor of creating a new state park in this area. While there is a need to purchase lands for fish and wildlife habitat, public access, and public recreation, I believe the construction of new state park is an extraneous expense (especially given the current economic climate), and will undermine the wild, undeveloped nature of this land parcel.
72	1	Is in favor of the Fish Creek acquisition.
72	2	"It is so selfish for us not to have this beautiful area."
72	3	It would be a boom for the Superior area.
72	4	It would increase [local?] property values.
72	5	Is for the State Park.
72	6	Wished it to be known that these comments are also to be attributed to the other members of his family (and he listed the 4 names of the others).
73		See pages A-50 to A-55
74	1	I.) INTRODUCTION. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed land acquisition in the Fish Creek area and proposed management strategies. As a hunter and angler, the Fish Creek Drainage is an important area to me. I have fished for trout and hunted deer and elk in the proposed acquisition area and I know first-hand how valuable these lands are for fish and wildlife, as well as outdoor recreation.
74	2	II.) GENERAL COMMENTS. I fully support Montana FWP acquiring these lands, however I am concerned about the size and scope of the proposed state park. I would prefer that all 40,945 acres were managed as a Wildlife Management Area (WMA) because I believe that the fish and wildlife values on these lands will be better managed and preserved as a WMA. This conclusion is drawn from the different – and potentially conflicting – purposes of State Parks and WMAs.

Com- ment #	Para- graph	Comment
74	3	According to Administrative Rules of Montana (ARM) 12.8.102, the sole purpose of a state park is: "To provide high-quality recreation experience distinctive and notable enough to attract people on a state, regional, or national basis." This purpose of a state park (recreation) can be in conflict with the stated goal of WMA's which is "to maintain vital wildlife habitat for the protection of species and the enjoyment of the public." (http://fwp.mt.gov/habitat/wma.html)
74	4	Clearly, the purpose of a State Park is primarily recreational while the purpose of a WMA is for wildlife. Given the immense fish and wildlife values present in the Fish Creek drainage, the potential for deleterious recreational impacts are far greater if managed as a state park. For this reason, I believe that the proposed acquisition would be better managed as a WMA.
74	5	However, if there is a demonstrated need for the potential front country recreation facilities that the EA identifies, such as an equestrian trailhead or developed campground, the acreage of the state park should reflect the minimal amount of acres required for these facilities while leaving the backcountry to be managed as a WMA.
74	6	In short, a state park of approximately 7,000 acres is excessive to meet any demonstrated recreational needs in the Fish Creek drainage, while the wildlife values present necessitates that as much of the acquisition as possible be managed as a WMA.
74	7	III.) SPECIFIC COMMENTS. The following are specific issues that the EA incorrectly addresses, fails to address, or are additional comments that I have.
74	8	1.) EA inappropriately pre-decides future decision making:
74	9	The Draft Management Plan states the following:
74	10	Management Strategies: Begin developing (with public involvement) a final management plan, which would provide for the following:
74	11	a) An appropriate number and distribution of front-country and backcountry campsites and/or areas.
74	12	b) A vehicle accessible front-country fee campground in the northern portion of the Fish Creek drainage.
74	13	c) A vehicle accessible front-country fee equestrian campground near the confluence area of the South and West Forks of Fish Creek. (Draft Preliminary Management Plan, B-13)
74	14	This statement is inappropriately pre-deciding the future development of the management plan by stating that the final management plan " would " include a fee equestrian campground, fee campground, and front and backcountry campsites. Based on public comments, budgetary constraints, fish and wildlife habitat requirements, etc...FWP may find that these facilities are not practical, prudent and/or wanted. For this reason, the draft management plan should state that the final management plan " may " provide for these facilities.
74	15	2.) Hunting Access. The EA states that "Within the State Park, implement a hunting access system that allows MFWP to monitor and regulate hunting activity and establish conditions that allow hunters and non-hunters to safely share recreational resources." (Draft Management Plan, B-14)
74	16	What kind of "hunting access system" is FWP contemplating for the State Park? I can understand the need for reasonable safety buffers around a campground, but how does FWP intend to "monitor and regulate" hunting activity. Will there be a lottery system for access, a sign in box, or some other system? I strongly encourage FWP to retain an open hunting access policy for the lands and not restrict access in anyway, with the exception of a reasonable safety buffer for front-country facilities.
74	17	3.) Commercial Outfitting. The EA is explicit in several places that outfitted hunting and fishing would not be allowed on the WMA, however, the EA seems to mistakenly state that hunting outfitting would be allowed on the state park. The EA states: "Commercial uses such as hunting and fishing, mountain bike concession or other public private partnerships could be permitted on the state park component in accordance with FWP commercial use rules." (EA, page 21)
74	18	However, FWP's Commercial Use Rules are explicit that all commercial hunting outfitting is prohibited on <u>all department lands</u> , not just WMA's. The Commercial Use Rules, ARM 12.14.115, state that: "Commercial hunting outfitting is prohibited on all department land and on water bodies that are located entirely within the boundaries of department land. Commercial fishing outfitting is prohibited on all wildlife management areas." Given FWP's Commercial Use rules, the EA should explicitly state that no commercial outfitting would be allowed on either the WMA or state park.
74	19	While commercial fishing outfitting could be allowed on the state park, the sensitivity of native bull trout and Westslope cutthroat trout in Fish Creek should make the department exclude commercial angling outfitting in the state park in addition to the WMA.
74	20	4.) Recreation and wildlife conflicts. The Draft Preliminary Management Plan states that "Overlapping land acquisition priorities occur in the northern portion of the Fish Creek drainage and are focused primarily on conflicting wildlife and recreation resource values." (Draft Preliminary Management Plan, B-20) Specifically, what are the wildlife values and recreation values that are in conflict and why are wildlife getting the short end of the stick with the entire northern portion of the Fish Creek Drainage proposed as part of the state park?

Com- ment #	Para- graph	Comment
74	21	5.) Motorized use. According to the Draft Preliminary Management Plan, motorized vehicle use would not be allowed on trails, stating that "On WMA properties, trail systems, as opposed to open road systems, will be limited to non-motorized travel" (Draft Preliminary Management Plan, B-22.) Meanwhile, it appears that OHV trail use could be allowed on the state park, with the Draft Preliminary Management Plan stating on B-22 that "OHV trail use occurring on the State Park unit could tie into open-roads on the WMA."
74	22	I strongly encourage FWP to only allow OHV use on open road systems for both the state park and the WMA. All lands in the proposed acquisition are important to, and used by a variety of, wildlife. The deleterious impacts of OHV use on wildlife are well-documented and it doesn't matter to an elk or grizzly bear if they are disturbed by an OHV while on a State Park or a WMA – the impact is the same. This issue highlights the management differences between a state park and a WMA, and why I would prefer that the lands in the proposed acquisition be managed as a WMA. Recreational activities such OHV use on trails is clearly on the table as an acceptable activity for the state park, while the WMA will not consider these kinds of activities because WMA's are managed for wildlife first, not recreation. As I have stated earlier, the lands in the proposed acquisition are of paramount importance for fish and wildlife and they should be managed first and foremost for fish and wildlife habitat, not recreation.
74	23	5.) Additional State Park Lands. One Feb 1, FWP published a revised Appendix A, which adds about 800 acres to the proposed park. Why was this revision included 11 days after the release of the draft EA without any explanation?
74	24	6.) State Park Facilities. While I would prefer that the entire 40,945 acre acquisition be managed as a WMA, I recognize that certain developed recreation facilities such as campgrounds – if sited properly – could mitigate the impacts of dispersed recreation due to focusing impacts in a hardened area. However, I strongly encourage FWP to limit the facilities to the following: 1.) places to pitch a tent or park a pop-up camper, 2.) vault toilet, 3.) fire rings, and 4.) a bear-proof dumpster.
74	25	The following list is not intended to be comprehensive, but it is a list of facilities and amenities provided at other state parks in Montana that are not appropriate or needed in the Fish Creek drainage if a state park is established: electrical hookups, RV dump stations, showers, flush toilets, group sites, pavilions, horseshoe pits, golf courses, playgrounds, firewood vendors, visitor center, food concession, boardwalks, yurts, cabins, huts, and comfort stations.
74	26	7.) Funding. The EA indicates that Access Montana has to be used for state parks of fishing access sites, stating that the purpose of Access Montana "is for the land acquisitions, land leasing, easement purchase, or development agreement for state parks and fishing access sites." (EA, page 9) However, I have not been able to find any reference in FWP's Administrative Rules or Access Montana's enabling legislation, HB 5 from the 2007 legislature, which indicates that Access Montana money can only be used for state parks or fishing access sites. If Access Montana is not specifically designated for state parks or fishing access site acquisitions, then I encourage FWP to maintain Access Montana funding for this project and to eliminate the proposed state park or to greatly reduce the size of the proposed state park in order to accommodate limited development of a primitive campground and/or equestrian trailhead.
74	27	IV.) CONCLUSION. Thank you for the opportunity to comments on this proposed acquisition. The importance of these lands for fish, wildlife and hunting and angling cannot be overstated. I fully support FWP acquiring these lands and I hope that they will be managed in a way that puts fish and wildlife – not recreation – first. If there must be a state parks component in order to acquire these lands, the size of the state parks should be reduced, the facilities/amenities offered should be minimized, and all recreation opportunities should be non-motorized.
75	1	I do not support the creation of a State Park on acquired lands by your Agency. I recognize this as an important purchase. By your own words in your EA, this is a pristine stream and spawning grounds, statistics to back that up, and the most important on the lower Clark Fork.
75	2	Why screw it up with a State Park? It would be ironic that during the stewardship of Plum Creek, the Creek has flourished the way it has. I firmly believe a State Park would be extremely detrimental to the Creek and the fishery. It is <u>A BAD IDEA.</u>
75	3	You have demonstrated that there is a need for lands to be held for fish and wildlife habitat, there is a need for public access (although regarding the river itself, there is more than adequate public access even if this went back to private ownership; but, I recognize we have the non river issues here also), and this leads to public recreation obviously.
75	4	I do not see where there is a demonstrated need to build a State Park, and expensive thing to manage, and an obvious detriment and contrary to fish and wildlife habitat needs.
75	5	I would support and be thankful for this purchase to occur strictly for management as a state wildlife management area. This would allow fish and wildlife, and cold water bull trout habitat, with their natural recreational results, be consistent with the conservation efforts we strive for.
75	6	We all know a park will undermine the fish and wildlife values of this jewel of a river. Come on, two campgrounds as you have expressed, improved? With the tag along items bring commercialism into it. You have got to be kidding that this is good for Fish Creek.
75	7	If you need a Park for Alberton Gorge, go buy land near Cyr, I know its available. It is unnecessary to develop campsites for Fish Creek drainage.

Com- ment #	Para- graph	Comment
75	8	I do applaud you for using our hunting and angling dollars for purchasing wildlife management areas. I'm glad TNC attempted to step in and bridge the gap for the state to get involved with a purchase for a WMA. But, development of a park is contrary to this goal, and is not necessary.
75	9	ACCESS Montana money is not pegged to developing a State Park as I see it. It appears that it is supposed be for purchasing land to protect access. I do not see a correlation between that and developing a State Park.
76	1	In considering more of the impacts on the general area that the proposed park might have west of Alberton, I would ask FWP to clarify for Mineral County citizens, who has ownership of the Cyr Bridge? While this does not reside in the zone specified in the EA, it could easily be determined that this bridge, as well as highway 10 would experience increased use. Citizens in this area have tried to obtain information on who has ownership of the Cyr bridge with no success. It is my hope that this can be clarified for the public before further use might be incurred.
76	2	As a side note, it would be nice if light pollution would be addressed, since we live in a pristine area where we enjoy the night sky without excessive light.
76	3	Thank you & I appreciate all that you do in your work,
77	1	I have been hunting in the Fish Creek drainage west of Missoula for several years. I've harvested several white tailed deer, including a couple nice bucks, and a quality 6 point bull elk in the southwestern portion of the proposed state park. While I fully support FWP's proposal to acquire nearly 41,000 acres in the Fish Creek drainage, I do not understand the logic of a 7,000 acre state park. I am especially bothered by the southern and western boundaries of the proposed state park – it is excessively large and could impact some extremely good hunting areas.
77	2	The Fish Creek area is incredibly important for fish, wildlife, hunting and fishing. Please modify the proposal to decrease the acreage of the state park and increase the acreage of the Wildlife Management Area (WMA) accordingly. A significantly smaller state park at the northern end of the acquisition will be a better fit for the historic and currant uses of Fish Creek. A larger WMA will ensure that the Fish Creek area provides quality hunting and fishing for generations to come.
77	3	Please move forward with the acquisition, but please consider my proposed modifications.

Com- ment #	Para- graph	Comment
		[Page A-24 is blank]